

# Innocents



*A side of family  
planning the White  
House does not discuss*

# BETRAYED

---

# **Innocents Betrayed:**

**A side of family planning  
the White House does not discuss**

## **Population Research Institute**

**5119A Leesburg Pike, Suite 295  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041**

**<http://www.pop.org> – email [popri@ix.netcom.com](mailto:popri@ix.netcom.com)**

---

# Table of Contents

<b>Foreword by Steven W. Mosher</b>	<b>4</b>
-------------------------------------	----------

*Third World population growth:  
First World's burden?*

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>6</b>
--------------------------	----------

<b>Reallocation of population control funds would save thousands of lives</b>	<b>7</b>
---	----------

*The allegations  
Problems with the allegations  
Reallocation to maternal and infant health care  
Reallocation to infrastructure development*

<b>Population control programs actually hurt countries</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------

*Bolivia  
Haiti  
Mexico  
Philippines*

<b>In whose interest? Money vs. people</b>	<b>13</b>
--	-----------

<b>US funds promote abortion</b>	<b>15</b>
----------------------------------	-----------

<b>The White House used outdated projections to reach its conclusions</b>	<b>16</b>
---	-----------

<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>17</b>
-------------------	-----------

<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>18</b>
-----------------	-----------

This report was prepared by the staff of the Population Research Institute.

© 1997 The Population Research Institute

*The mission of the Population Research Institute is:*

*To articulate and promote authentic economic development through models which recognize the material and social benefits of moderate population growth;*

*To make a case against the widely held, but fundamentally wrongheaded development paradigm which places economic growth and population growth in opposition to each other;*

*To document and publicize abuses of human rights committed in the name of population control.*

---

## *Third World Population Growth: White Man's Burden?* *Foreword by Steven W. Mosher*

**J**ohn D. Rockefeller III's 1958 swing through Asia had momentous consequences for the cultures of the world. For the scion of the Rockefeller family came back from a close encounter with Asian poverty convinced that population control, not economic development, was the cure. And he returned ready to put his millions to work towards that end. The peasant societies of Asia, Africa, and Latin America would never be the same.

By the late sixties, American family planning field workers bearing boxes of contraceptives were

a common sight in many countries. The villagers they approached, residents of a calmer, more congenial world, rarely rejected these gifts outright. "[The workers] were so nice," one Indian man later remarked, "And they came from distant lands to be with us. All they wanted was that we accept the [foam] tablets. I lost nothing and probably received their prayers. And they, they must have gotten some promotion."

This villager's shrewd guess could not have been closer to the mark. From the beginning, the success of population control programs has been measured not by declines in fertility, but by the numbers of "acceptors" it generates. Those workers who meet their quotas of acceptors are promoted; those country programs that meet their targets are expanded. Since those that fail on either count are terminated, there is little

incentive to make sure that all this contraceptive largess is used for its intended purpose. One villager used his free boxes of vaginal foaming tablets, their contents undisturbed, to build a little temple in his living room to the local Hindu deity.

The leaders of newly independent states had little use for this new wave of secular missionar-

ies or the anti-natal religion they preached. It seemed to many that a new and insidious form of cultural imperialism was being unleashed on them by their former colonial masters. Had they known of the existence of National Security

---

*No longer was our congenial Indian villager merely to be given boxes of contraceptives with which to build temples. Instead, he was to be sterilized. Governments officials were assigned vasectomy quotas, and denied raises, transfers and even salaries until they had sterilized the requisite number of men.*

---

Study Memorandum 200, a remarkably chauvinistic document produced by the US National Security Council in 1972, perhaps they would have barred the condom bearers entirely.

Written in near-apocalyptic terms, this secret report declared continued world population growth to be a grave threat to US national security. If the peasant hordes of Asia, Africa and Latin America were allowed to multiply, it declared, their search for social justice would inevitably lead them to communism. This would limit America's access to strategic minerals and other raw materials, both directly through the action of hostile regimes, and indirectly because of greatly expanded local consumption.

Thus was population control declared to be a weapon in the cold war. The immediate result was a huge jump in population control spending

---

by the US and its allies. Dozens of countries around the world were targeted, especially those which were considered to be vulnerable to communist insurrection (such as Thailand), and those sitting on top of valuable metals (such as the southern tier of Africa).

The programs themselves also become more sophisticated, especially in the use of surrogates. To answer the charge of cultural imperialism, local elites in targeted countries were recruited to serve as the public face of these new programs. To avoid the appearance of neo-colonialism, US population control funding was increasingly funneled through international organizations like the United Nations Population Fund and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Having muted, or at least neutralized, many of its developing world critics, the stage was set for a war on population. The National Security Council, in a follow-up study, issued specific guidelines on how this war should be fought.

“[P]opulation programs,” this report noted, “have been particularly successful where leaders have made their positions clear, unequivocal and public, while maintaining discipline down the line from national to village levels, marshaling governmental workers (including police and military), doctors and motivators to see that population policies are well administered and executed. Such direction is the *sine qua non* of an effective program.”

The NSC report might have been describing the enforcement mechanism of China’s draconian one-child policy, which relies upon a “well administered and executed” program of forced abortion, forced sterilization, and forced contraception to eliminate excess births. While passing over China’s obvious reliance on coercion in silence, the report did find overall trends in its program to be “encouraging.” “Encouraging” was also used to describe the programs of two other countries now well known for abuses, Indonesia and India.

At the time the NSC report was written, India

was in the middle of its infamous “compulsuasion” campaign. Although this strange word was an amalgam of *compulsion* and *persuasion*, the emphasis was definitely on the former. No longer was our congenial Indian villager merely to be given boxes of contraceptives with which to build temples. Instead, he was to be sterilized. Government officials were assigned vasectomy quotas, and denied raises, transfers and even salaries until they had sterilized the requisite number of men.

At the same time it was privately commending India’s programs, the NSC strongly cautioned against public praise. “We recommend that US officials refrain from public comment on forced-paced measures such as those currently under active consideration in India . . . [because that] might have an unfavorable impact on existing voluntary programs.” Indeed, the NSC cynically advised US officials to pretend a complete lack of interest in population control. “[A]void the language of ‘birth control’ in favor of ‘family planning’ or ‘responsible parenthood,’ with the emphasis being placed on child spacing in the interests of the health of child and mother. . .”

With the US looking benignly on, several million “compulsuasion” sterilizations took place in India. The program was wildly unpopular, especially among untouchables and Muslims, and riots followed. For the rumor (later verified as fact) had spread that the Hindu majority was deliberately targeting low caste and minority groups for sterilization in an effort to reduce their numbers.

Such an obvious and callous display of racial and religious bigotry is easy to condemn. But how can we possibly claim the moral superiority to do so? For our own government more than twenty years ago set in motion a policy designed to eliminate our own version of low caste and minority groups — the poor Africans, Latinos, and Asians of the world.

---

## *Executive Summary*

The purpose of this Population Research Institute (PRI) report is to respond to the assumptions and conclusions contained in President Clinton's Finding of January 31, 1997, entitled "The Impact of Delaying USAID Population Funding from March to July 1997: Justification for a Presidential Determination on Section 518A(a) of the FY97 Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act," hereafter referred to as the Finding.

The Population Research Institute has five primary objections to the conclusions reached in the President's Finding, as follows:

*(1) Reallocation of USAID population control funding to authentic economic development would save the lives of thousands of women and children.*

*(2) Population control programs are actually detrimental to the countries listed*

*in the President's finding.*

*(3) The USAID population control program appears to be motivated by safeguarding U.S. economic interests, not the health and safety of the women and young children of developing countries.*

*(4) USAID funds help promote abortion throughout the developing world, by funding pro-abortion organizations such as the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF).*

*(5) The President's Finding uses outdated population projections to reach its conclusions.*

The basis for these objections are documented herein.



---

*To avoid the appearance of neo-colonialism, US population control funding was increasingly funneled through international organizations like the United Nations Population Fund and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.*

---

---

## *Reallocation of Population Control Funds Would Save Thousands of Lives*

### **The Allegations**

The President's Finding states that "Increases in unintended pregnancies and abortions would be inevitable ... The consequences would be increased unintended pregnancies, more abortions, higher numbers of maternal and infant deaths, and, of course, more births" (pages 1 and 3). It also states as fact that "... most of all, the health and well-being of women, men and children who are beneficiaries of U.S. assistance would be severely threatened" (page 1).

These conclusions appear to be drawn from the January 1997 Rockefeller Foundation report entitled *High Stakes: The United States, Global Population and Our Common Future*.

*High Stakes* alleges that:

*The cuts in population assistance have had devastating and immediate effects. A group of five leading U.S. research organizations (The Alan Guttmacher Institute, The Futures Group, Population Action International and Population Reference Bureau, in consultation with The Population Council) has estimated the effects. In just one year:*

- \* 7 million couples in developing countries will lose access to modern contraceptives, resulting in 4 million unplanned pregnancies ;*
- \* 1.6 million of those pregnancies will end in abortion;*
- \* 8,000 more women will die in pregnancy and childbirth; and*
- \* 134,000 more infants will die as a result of an increase in high-risk births."*

---

*This reveals an extremely important failing of the President's Finding, because it is based on the Rockefeller Foundation and Population Council reports: No new research has been performed to buttress its conclusions.*

---

*High Stakes* merely repeats the figures first published in an Alan Guttmacher Institute (AGI) Memorandum of March 6, 1996, entitled "Estimate of Number of Additional Abortions, Maternal Deaths and Infant Deaths Resulting from a 35% Cut in USAID Funding for Family Planning for All Countries Excluding China."

### **Problems With the Allegation**

To begin with, the amount of money being contested in March 1996 was \$190 million, and the amount of money currently at stake is \$123 million ) about one-third less. Yet the Rockefeller Foundation merely repeats the numbers found in the AGI memorandum.

This reveals an extremely important failing of the President's Finding, because it is based on the Rockefeller Foundation and Population Council reports: *No new research has been performed to buttress its conclusions.* In other words, the Finding simply regurgitates the previous figures without regard for changing conditions or the facts.

On March 18, 1996, the Population Research Institute published an analysis of the AGI memorandum. The PRI report found that the AGI memorandum was fatally flawed in its assumptions and calculations, thereby rendering its

---

conclusions meaningless. For example, the AGI completely disregarded the effects of the more than 400,000 contraceptive failures that would occur among users if the 35% funding cut were restored, and it grossly overestimated both maternal and infant mortality rates in developing countries. These and other basic errors had a cumulative effect that led AGI to overestimate by 81% the total number of unwanted pregnancies that would occur as a result of a 35% cut in USAID population programs. This, in turn, led AGI to overestimate by 121% the numbers of maternal deaths and infant deaths that would allegedly occur due to the March 1996 funding cuts.

## **Reallocation to Maternal and Infant Health Care**

More importantly, the PRI report showed that a *reallocation* of the contested \$190 million to prenatal and infant care in the poorest nations would save the lives of 94,671 women and children, or 30,483 more than would be saved if the money were given to USAID for population control programs.

The PRI report concluded that *if the contested \$190 million were disbursed for population purposes, instead of being used for prenatal and infant care, more than 30,000 women and children would die as a result.* Because the impacts of reallocation are directly proportional to the amount of money reallocated, *if the contested \$123 million were disbursed for population purposes, instead of being used for prenatal and infant care, about 20,000 women and children would die as a result.*

---

*The PRI report concluded that if the contested \$190 million were disbursed to USAID, instead of being used for prenatal and infant care, more than 30,000 women and children would die as a result. Because the impacts of reallocation are directly proportional to the amount of money reallocated, if the contested \$123 million were disbursed to USAID, instead of being used for prenatal and infant care, about 20,000 women and children would die as a result.*

---

Even more lives would be saved if this funding were redirected into other bona fide health care programs such as providing vitamin supplements or vaccinations to poor children around the world. UNICEF estimates that 2.1 million children each are dying from vaccine-preventable diseases, and that Vitamin A supplements could avert an estimated 1-2 millions deaths each year.

The March 18, 1996 Population Institute Review response to the Alan Guttmacher Institute report is available from the Population Research Institute upon request.

## **Reallocation to Infrastructure Development**

It is often said that “economic development is the best contraceptive.” This means that, when modern equipment and basic health

care are available to rural people, they don’t have to have many children in order to work the fields, to insure that some children survive, or to take care of them when they are old and infirm. Additionally, as a nation develops, young people tend to marry later and have their first child later as well.

Construction of basic infrastructure in developing countries would not only bring the population growth rate down, it would improve the quality of life of the people dramatically.

The total present worth of USAID population control expenditures since 1964 has been \$10,679,523,000 in current (February 1997) dollars.<sup>1</sup> If this money had been reallocated towards infrastructure construction in developing countries, it would have at least:



*\* Built 50,000 miles of hard-surface roads and bridges connecting twenty thousand remote villages to the national road system, allowing them to ship their goods to market and have access to the national highway system; and*

*\* Brought electricity and clean drinking water to 2,000 of the most remote villages, thereby cutting down the source of most disease and increasing production towards self-sufficiency.*

*\* Built 30,000 well-equipped basic health care clinics in remote villages that could care for the health of millions of country people, and cut maternal and infant mortality in those villages in half; and*



It is too late now, of course, to “take back” the more than ten billion dollars that have been squandered on population control and reallocate it to authentic economic development. However, it is *not* too late to reallocate this year’s USAID funding to purposes that will strengthen entire nations, instead of merely turning big poor families into *small* poor families.



*\* Built grain storage facilities for 20,000 remote villages, so their rice and other harvests are not partly or mostly consumed by insects and rodents; and*

*\* Built and staffed enough modern schools to properly educate a million rural children who would otherwise receive little or no education; and*



---

## *Population Control Programs actually hurt countries*

### **Overview**

Pages 11 through 14 of the President's Finding lists fifteen specific countries that would allegedly suffer detrimental effects caused by cuts in the USAID population program.

The introductory paragraph on page 11 claims that "all of the countries listed below are experiencing rapid population growth, with annual rates of growth exceeding 2 percent. The exceptions are Turkey, where the annual growth rate is 1.6 percent, and Russia and the Ukraine, which both have low fertility but extremely high abortion rates."

To begin with, the President's finding uses population growth rates that are more than a decade old, and therefor greatly overestimate the actual current rates. It claims that twelve of the fifteen countries listed have annual population growth rates exceeding 2.0 percent; in reality, only six of them do.<sup>2</sup>

More specifically and to the point, every one of the countries listed in the President's Finding have been harmed by United States population control efforts, as described below. If the US government is truly concerned about the health of women and infants, it should conduct an independent review of USAID population control programs in recipient countries using bona fide health care professionals who have no relationship with, or interest in, the continuation of such programs. Such a review would, we believe, reach the conclusion that USAID population control programs should be terminated and the funds redirected to maternal and infant child care and authentic economic development.

It would be impossible to list all of the incidents of the extraordinary damage inflicted upon the people and cultures of developing countries by US-funded population programs. We have selected four of the countries listed in the President's Finding

---

*To begin with, the President's researcher(s) are using population growth rates that are more than a decade old. They claim that twelve of the fifteen countries listed have annual population growth rates exceeding 2.0 percent; in reality, only six of them do.*

---

which exemplify certain negative consequences of such programs. Similar ill effects could be adduced for virtually all the developing nations which have been targeted for population control.

\* ***Bolivia.*** *Bolivia's problem is not overpopulation, but underpopulation. The current total population of the country is 8,230,000 persons in an area of 1,089,581 square kilometers, for a population density of only 8 persons per square kilometer, compared to Europe's 103 persons per square kilometer. The total fertility rate has plunged from 7.3 children per woman in 1965 to 4.2 children per woman currently, a drop of 42 percent.<sup>2</sup> Such a large decrease in such a short time will inevitably lead to massive strains on Bolivia's social security system, as fewer and fewer wage earners support more and more retired persons, and the population pyramid becomes inverted. In addition, Bolivia currently experiences significant labor shortages, suffering particularly from a lack of able-bodied workers to develop its mineral resources.*

\* ***Haiti.*** *According to the British Broadcasting Corporation's Horizon Television Show "The Human Laboratory" of*

November 7, 1995, the United States has a long and dishonorable history of using Haitian women as guinea-pigs for the testing of new contraceptives. USAID has carried out Norplant testing in Cite Soleil, one of the poorest communities in Haiti. Norplant insertions were done without the informed consent of the women concerned. Norplant removals were denied or delayed, even to women who suffered extremely severe side effects such as bleeding extensive enough to cause anemia or paralyzing headaches. Women who complained were verbally abused by clinic personnel. Complications were not recorded, in what the BBC suggested was an effort to ensure a positive outcome for the drug trial. Such blatant violations of human rights not only hurts poor women, it helps to ensure that all future USAID-funded programs will be viewed with a jaundiced eye.

\* **Mexico.** The total fertility rate among Mexican women has plummeted from 8.2 children per woman in 1965 to 2.7 children per woman currently, a drop of 67 percent. This is the second highest in Latin America, behind Jamaica's 69 percent.<sup>2</sup> Mexico's social security system is already coming under intense strain, because the current generation is much smaller than the previous one, leading to first a diamond-shaped population pyramid and then an inverted population pyramid, indicating a rapidly greying population. This situation is exacerbated by massive emigration, both

legal and illegal, of able-bodied young people to the United States and other countries.

The last sentence of this subparagraph of the President's Finding exposes the true motivation behind U.S. population programs in Mexico: "If USAID cannot meet its funding commitments, not only would programs suffer, but US credibility would be damaged as would US ability to leverage Mexican resources in the future."

\* **Philippines.** One of the largest beneficiaries of USAID funds is the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), which has been relentlessly promoting abortion in the Philippines for more than thirty years in flagrant disregard for the nation's customs, laws and religious beliefs. The following extract from a Hastings Center Report article shows how the IPPF assists groups in circumventing the laws of developing countries, while systematically covering up such activities:

The International Planned Parenthood Federation of London (IPPF) has been the most outspoken advocate of legal abortion services in the developing countries ... As a central body it receives funds from international donors, including AID [the United States Agency for International Development], and passes money and supplies along to the local associations ... The IPPF's stated position is that abortion

Amazingly, the last sentence of this subparagraph of the President's Finding exposes the true motivation behind U.S. population programs in Mexico: "If USAID cannot meet its funding commitments, not only would programs suffer, but US credibility would be damaged as would US ability to leverage Mexican resources in the future."

---

*should be legally available to those who desire it and that local associations, when possible, should assist in providing the necessary services ...*

*In the Philippines, where abortion is both illegal and explicitly against official population policy, the IPPF provided 200 ‘menstrual regulation’ [first trimester abortion] kits for demonstration purposes ... Further controversy arose when the FPOP [the IPPF affiliate, Family Planning Organization of the Philippines] distributed ‘menstrual regulation’ kits to local doctors. Although the government had laws specifically prohibiting the importation of abortive devices, these kits were brought into the country as ‘medical instruments’ to obtain ‘sample tissue for examination.’ These examples show the potential of the IPPF and its collaborating organizations for circumventing national laws and policies ...*

*One of IPPF’s largest projects, totalling about \$62,000, was in Bangladesh, where 5,000 vacuum aspiration kits were provided to the local family planning association. These kits have also been supplied to Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Thailand, Vietnam, and India. Although most of these projects have been relatively small - usually under \$30,000 - the IPPF has not provided details of its activities in its published reports, even in its main report to donor agencies. One reason, apart from the illegal and controversial nature of these activities, may be that the federation is under constant scrutiny from the U.S. government to insure that it is not violating the Helms Amendment.<sup>3</sup>*

---

*“We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage*

---

The IPPF’s abortion agenda in the Philippines was recently exposed by the head of its local affiliate, the Family Planning Organization of the Philippines (FPOP). Ramon Tagle, a well-known Manila attorney and President of FPOP, resigned in protest over what he called IPPF’s “hidden agenda” on abortion and its continuing efforts to use FPOP as a trojan horse to legalize abortion in his country.

Senator Juan Flavio Velasco recently criticized IPPF and the United States when he said that “We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage ... I strongly oppose abortion. It is prohibited by our laws and the Philippine Constitution. Hence, we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children.”<sup>4</sup>

By funding the IPPF through USAID, the United States is providing financial support to an organization which advocates, as a first principle, the worldwide legalization of abortion, even if this means violating the national sovereignty and undermining the traditional values and cultural norms of developing countries. Our support for such insensitive policies resurrects the specter of the “ugly American,” and impedes genuine efforts to assist in the economic development of other nations.

---

## *In whose interest? Money vs. people*

The President's Finding states that "Progress toward global population stabilization has been recognized as vital to U.S. foreign policy interests for the past three decades."

These "foreign policy interests" are principally strategic and economic in nature and are described in the National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 200 of April 24, 1974, subject: "Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests."

Chapter III of NSSM 200, entitled "Minerals and Fuel," states that:

*Whether through government action, labor conflicts, sabotage, or civil disturbance, the smooth flow of needed materials will be jeopardized. Although population pressure is obviously not the only factor involved, these types of frustrations are much less likely under conditions of slow or zero population growth ... The U.S. economy will require large and increasing amounts of minerals from abroad, especially from less developed countries [See National Commission on Materials Policy, Towards a National Materials Policy: Basic Data and Issues, April 1972]. That fact gives the U.S. enhanced interest in the political, economic, and social stability of the supplying countries. Wherever a lessening of population pressures through reduced birth rates can increase the prospects for such stability, population policy becomes relevant to resource supplies and to the economic interests of the United States.*

Part Two of NSSM 200, entitled "Policy Recommendations," states that:

---

*The conclusion of this view is that mandatory [population control] programs may be needed and that we should be considering these possibilities now ... On what basis should such food resources then be provided? Would food be considered an instrument of national power? Will we be forced to make choices as to whom we can reasonably assist, and if so, should population efforts be a criterion for such assistance?*

---

*It is vital that the effort to develop and strengthen a commitment on the part of the LDC [less developed countries] leaders not be seen by them as an industrialized country policy to keep their strength down or to reserve resources for use by the "rich" countries. Development of such a perception could create a serious backlash adverse to the cause of population stability ...*

*The conclusion of this view is that mandatory [population control] programs may be needed and that we should be considering these possibilities now ... On what basis should such food resources then be provided? Would food be considered an instrument of national power? Will we be forced to make choices as to whom we can reasonably assist, and if so, should population efforts be a criterion for such assistance? ... we should recognize that those who argue along ideological lines have made a great deal of the fact that the U.S. contribution to*

---

*development programs and health programs has steadily shrunk, whereas funding for population programs has steadily increased.*

These statements infer that a large population in a lesser-developed countries (LDCs) leads to a strong international presence that is not easily manipulated. The United States, in order to maintain the flow of raw materials from these countries, must be certain that their populations are “stabilized” through “lessening of population pressures through reduced birth rates.” LDC leaders must not see this effort as a form of imperialism by developed countries, so USAID and other government agencies funnel funds and resources through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), the Pathfinder Fund, and various United Nations organs such as the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA). These population control programs may even be made compulsory in the future (as they are now in the People’s Republic of China), and aid in the form of medical assistance or food may be made contingent upon acceptance of population control measures that desperate countries and peoples would not otherwise accept.

Although the President’s Finding does not baldly state its intentions, it still hints that its primary motivation is the preservation of U.S. economic options overseas. For instance, it says that “If USAID cannot meet its funding commitments, not only would programs suffer, but US credibility would be damaged as would US ability to leverage Mexican resources in the future.”

The Finding also says that “If a nine-month funding delay occurs in FY97, there could be serious contraceptive shortages ... as well as potential loss of jobs at one or more of USAID’s contraceptive manufacturers in Alabama, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania ... That would result in disruptions in condom shipments to field programs and require the manufacturer to lay off most of the 200 workers dedicated to USAID contract production” (pages 15 and 16).

These statements bear a family resemblance to



certain assertions contained in the Rockefeller Foundation’s January 1997 report entitled *High Stakes: The United States, Global Population and Our Common Future*. Beginning in the late 1950s, the Rockefeller Foundation has been a relentless advocate of population control programs for developing countries. In expensive full-page advertisements in the January 30, 1997 *Roll Call*, and the February 2, 1997 *Washington Post*, the Rockefeller Foundation said that “As population growth exacerbates poverty in many developing countries, opportunities for U.S. exports could stagnate. High fertility drives down wages, encouraging the export of U.S. jobs.”

We believe that the preponderance of the evidence shows that there is a generally positive relationship between population and economic growth. The most important determinants of a country’s economic development, however, are its political and economic system, not the size of rate of growth of its population. But even if it were the case (and we do not believe it is) that high fertility in foreign countries “encourages the export of US jobs,” is it morally justifiable to consciously and deliberately set out to reduce the populations of its potential economic competitors, as America has done for the past thirty years?

---

## *US funds promote abortion*

The President's Finding states that "As a matter of longstanding law and policy of this and previous Administrations, USAID funds may not be used either to fund abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate any person to have an abortion."

In fact, there is ample evidence that USAID funds go to organizations which promote and perform abortions, such as the IPPF.

The Population

Research Institute's February 3, 1997, report *Abortion for All: How the International*

*Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) Promotes Abortion Around the World* details this advocacy. The PRI report uses IPPF's documents, particularly its *Vision 2000 Strategic Plan*, to demonstrate unequivocally IPPF, both

directly and through its 140 national affiliates, is aggressively agitating for legalized abortion all over the world, often in direct defiance of the laws of host nations.

---

*In fact, there is ample evidence that USAID funds go to organizations which promote and perform abortions, such as the IPPF.*

---



---

## *The White House used outdated projections to reach its conclusions*

The President's Finding asserts no fewer than four times (pages 2, 4, 5, and 22) that "world population will double to over 11 billion by 2050." These repeated assertions that the world's population will double in a little over a half a century and, presumably, continue to grow after that, lend the Finding a tone of calculated urgency, if not downright stridency. And it is wrong.

The population of the world will never again double. According to all Census Bureau and United Nations median and "most probable" projections, population growth will peak in the next few decades and then begin to decline. United Nations "medium variant" projection has the population of the world peaking at 9.4 billion in the year 2050.<sup>6</sup>

In fact, according to the UN's "low variant" population projection, which over the past decade has proven to be the most accurate of the three variants, total world population will never exceed 7.8 billion persons, and will top out between 2030 and 2040 and then sharply decline.

This means that the conclusions of the President's finding are based on population projections that, according to the UN, are at least 1.6 billion persons too high and possibly as much as 3.6 billion

On page 23 of the President's Finding, there is a graph showing that world population will peak at about 8.6 billion with widespread family planning, and at about 12.2 billion without widespread family planning. The implication, of course, is that worldwide *mandatory* family planning is essential in order to avoid a global population overload.

The figures used in this particular graph date from the late eighties when the annual population increment was peaking. It is hard to understand why the Finding, which was presumably drafted by USAID researchers with easy access to the latest population figures from the US Census Bureau and the UN, would use such outdated figures. Unless, of course, the intent was to exaggerate the rate of population increase in an effort to justify additional population funding.

---

*On page 23 of the President's Finding, there is a graph showing that world population will peak at about 8.6 billion with widespread family planning, and at about 12.2 billion without widespread family planning. The implication, of course, is that worldwide mandatory family planning is essential in order to avoid a global population overload. The figures used in this particular graph date from the late eighties when the annual population increment was peaking. It is hard to understand why the Finding, which was presumably drafted by USAID researchers with easy access to the latest population figures from the US Census Bureau and the UN, would use such outdated figures. Unless, of course, the intent was to exaggerate the rate of population increase in an effort to justify additional population funding.*

---

---

## Conclusion

**T**he Population Council, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Alan Guttmacher Institute have provided the United States government with reports whose conclusions are based upon faulty assumptions, statistics and research methods. It is therefore inevitable that President Clinton's Finding would reflect these fundamental errors when reaching its conclusion that USAID population control funding should be released early.

This report shows that United States population control funding has injured and is based on on a narrow and wrongheaded view of America's interests. We believe that the current restrictions on USAID population planning funds are reasonable and should be retained. We also recommend the formation of an independent commission to assess and evaluate the rationale, efficacy, and impact of population control spending, as compared with other forms of foreign aid.

---

*This report shows that United States population control funding has injured and is based on on a narrow and wrongheaded view of America's interests. We believe that the current restrictions on USAID population planning funds are reasonable and should be retained.*

---



---

## *Endnotes*

- <sup>1</sup> USAID population control expenditures are from a table “United States Agency for International Development Population Assistance - All Accounts (\$000).” Consumer Price Index from United States Census Bureau. Reference Data Book and Guide to Sources, *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (1995 Edition). Table 761, “Consumer Price Indexes (CPI by Major Groups: 1960 to 1994).”
- <sup>2</sup> The World Resources Institute, in Collaboration with the United Nations Environment Program and the United Nations Development Program. *World Resources 1994-5: Guide to the Global Environment*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. Table 16.2, “Trends in Births, Life Expectancy, Fertility and Age Structure, 1970-95.” Total fertility rates given in the table are for the periods 1970-1975 and 1990-1995. These rates are assumed to be representative of their midpoints, i.e., 1972 and 1992. The 1965 and 1997 rates are exponentially extrapolated using the average 1972-1992 rate. The current population growth rate in Haiti is 1.6% per year; in Mexico, 1.9% per year; El Salvador, 2.0% per year; the Dominican Republic, 1.8% per year; the Philippines, 1.9% per year; Turkey, 2.0% per year; Ukraine, stable population; Russia, 0.2% per year, and Zimbabwe, 1.6% per year.
- <sup>3</sup> Donald Page Warwick. “Foreign Aid for Abortion.” *The Hastings Center Report*, Volume 10, Number 2, page 33, April 1980.
- <sup>4</sup> Juliet Labog-Javellana. “Flavier Hits US Pressure on Abortion.” *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, July 9, 1996, page 2.
- <sup>5</sup> David S. Broder. “A Vote for Poor Women Overseas.” *Washington Post*, February 2, 1997, page C7.
- <sup>6</sup> “World Population Prospects: The 1996 Revision, Annex I.” United Nations, Population Division, November